UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

αℓ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,171	01/17/2002	Shinji Negishi	09792909-5310	3180

26263   7590   03/07/2006

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/052,171	NEGISHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M. Stevens	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-86* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *28-76* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27, 77-86* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 12/19/2005.

2.   This action is **NON-FINAL**.

3.   The Office withdraws the previous action rejections of claims 1-10, 12-17, 21-22 and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Guthrie, in view of the amendment.

4.   The Office withdraws the previous action rejections of claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Guthrie and Sokolov, in view of the amendment.

5.   The Office withdraws the previous action rejections of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Guthrie and Underwood, in view of the amendment.

6.   Claims 1-27 and 77-86 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 10 and 22 are independent. Claims 77-86 are new. Claims 28-76 have been previously withdrawn.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

7.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/22/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   **Claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-27 and 77-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being

unpatentable over Britton (US Patent No. 6,591,289, filed Jul. 27, 1999 and issued Jul. 8, 2003,

hereafter referred to as "Britton") in view of Harrington et al (US Patent No. 6,775,820, filed

Nov. 29, 2000 and issued Aug. 10, 2004, hereafter referred to as "Harrington").

Independent claim 1 states:

> *A conversion apparatus receiving a document and a script as receiving data, comprising:*
> *a memory for storing at least the script extracted from the receiving data, the*
> *memory being located on a server configured to receive and send data to a client; and*
> *computer-readable code for substituting a script calling portion in the document*
> *with a portion for calling the script stored in said memory.*

Britton, in the Abstract, discloses a client computer providing a template file to a server.
The template file includes a script. In Fig. 3, Britton further teaches the use of memory in the
form of file #44 and database #46 servers. It is also inherent that the Web server #42, would
have memory for storing the script in order to execute that script. Britton further discloses in
Fig. 3 #48 a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c',
which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602. However, Britton does not
explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts in the
Abstract and also in Fig. 5. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that
this recoding process encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic
Script.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have
allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on
an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable
to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Harrington discloses JavaScript embedded in a document in the Abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Britton discloses separating a document and a script by having the document reference the script in col. 7 lines 38-42. It is well known to provided data/scripts/objects/etc. separate from the document or program that calls them.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Britton the well known use of servers in Fig 3. Web server 42 relays data to/from client #60 in that figure.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Britton the well known use of servers in Fig 3. It is implicit that these servers have memory for storing documents/scripts in order that the servers may execute these documents/scripts.

Independent claim 6 is directed to a method implemented by the apparatus of claim 1. As such, this claim is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 7-9 are substantially similar to claims 2-3 and 5, respectively, and therefore

likewise rejected.

Independent claim 10 states:

A script conversion system comprising a relay server for sending and receiving data to and from at least one client, said script conversion system being used for requesting a document and displaying the requested document by said client, said relay server comprising:
       conversion means for receiving a document and a script, extracting at least the script from the document and the script and storing the script in storage means, substituting a script calling portion in the document with a portion for calling the script stored in said storage means, and outputting a resulting document as a converted document; and
       script execution means for executing the script, wherein said relay server sends the converted document to said client, and a script called by said client is executed by said script execution means.

Britton, in the Abstract, discloses a client computer providing a template file to a server.

The template file includes a script. In Fig. 3, Britton further teaches the use of memory in the

form of file #44 and database #46 servers. It is also inherent that the Web server #42, would

have memory for storing the script in order to execute that script. Britton further discloses in

Fig. 3 #48 a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c',

which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602. However, Britton does not

explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts in the

Abstract and also in Fig. 5. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that

this recoding process encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic

Script. This process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the

original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Britton discloses storing of documents on servers in

Fig. 4. In particular, file server #44 contains documents that the client wishes to view. Database

server #46 also contains records of past client interactions.

Claim 13 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Britton discloses storing of documents on servers in

Fig. 2. In particular, refer to file server #44 and database server #46. The Office respectfully

notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML document, script, etc.) of the data does not affect

the storage capability of the storage devices. However, Britton does not explicitly teach script

substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts in the Abstract and also in Fig.

5. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process

encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is

further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claims 15-16, Britton discloses storing of documents on multiple

servers in Fig. 2. In particular, refer to file server #44 and database server #46.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Britton discloses the returning of a server-executed

document as #45c' in Fig. 3 and in col. 8 lines 1-7, which discusses sending 45c' to the client's

browser.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Britton discloses the authenticating of a client in Fig. 4,

which provides a client login GUI incorporating a user ID and password. It is implicit that if one

is employing a login screen that one is authenticating access against a list of allowed users.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Britton discloses the use of a database server having,

inter alia, a list of records concerning customer/client orders. Additionally, col. 8 lines 33-54

describe an ordering system. It is implicit that an ordering system would have been tied in with a

billing system, so that clients placing orders for goods/services would have also been billed for

those goods/services. Britton further discloses the returning of a server-executed document as

#45c' in Fig. 3 and in col. 8 lines 1-7, which discusses sending 45c' to the client's browser. It is

also inherent that a client device would have been capable of executing that received document,

especially in light of Fig. 3 client browser #65, which is executing on client #60, and which

operates on documents such as #45c'.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Britton discloses the use of accounting means in Fig. 4,

especially #49. The records of element #49 provide a mechanism for storing client orders, as

explained in col. 9 lines 19-27. Further, col. 9 lines 1-14 describe the updating of a customer

account based on transactions made by the customer.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Britton discloses a file server #44 in Fig. 3. File servers

are well-known for storing files in advance.

Independent claim 22 states:

*A script conversion method for requesting from at least one client to a document server
to send a document via a relay server and displaying the requested document in said client and
for displaying the received document, said script conversion method comprising:*
      *receiving the document and a script from said document server by said relay
server;*
      extracting at least the script from the document and the script;
      storing the script in storage means;
      *substituting a script calling portion with a portion for calling the script stored in
said storage means;*
      outputting a resulting document as a converted document;
      sending the converted document to said client; and
      *executing, on the relay server, a script in the converted document called by said
client.*

Britton, in the Abstract, discloses a client computer providing a template file to a server. The template file includes a script. In Fig. 3, Britton further teaches the use of memory in the form of file #44 and database #46 servers. It is also inherent that the Web server #42, would have memory for storing the script in order to execute that script. Britton further discloses in Fig. 3 #48 a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602. It is inherent that the script interpreter would have had to parse or extract the script. However, Britton does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Claim 24 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Britton discloses storing of documents on multiple

servers in Fig. 2. In particular, refer to file server #44 and database server #46. The Office

respectfully notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML document, script, etc.) of the data

does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices. Britton further discloses a browser

display means in Fig. 2 #65. However, Britton does not explicitly teach script substitution.

Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would

have been inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington.

Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process

encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is

further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Claim 26 is substantially similar to claim 12, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Britton discloses storing of documents on multiple

servers in Fig. 2. In particular, refer to file server #44 and database server #46. The Office

respectfully notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML document, script, etc.) of the data

does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices.

Regarding dependent claim 77, Britton discloses a script interpreter #48 in Fig. 3 for

executing a script upon a client request to do so.

Regarding dependent claim 78, Britton discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client

document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It is

well-known for computers, such as web server #48, to provide a caching capability.

Regarding dependent claim 79, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c'. However, Britton does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington,

though, discloses the recoding of scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in

Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of

Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding

process encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This

process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original

script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 80, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c'. Britton further discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client

document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It is

well-known for computers, such as web server #48, to provide a caching capability. It is also a

well-known practice to put links in HTML documents, such as Fig. 3 #45c'. However, Britton

does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of

scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been

inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520

and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script

conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col.

6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 81, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c'. Britton further discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client

document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It is

well-known for computers, such as web server #48, to provide a caching capability. It is also a

well-known practice to put links in HTML documents, such as Fig. 3 #45c'. However, Britton

does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of

scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been

inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520

and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script

conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col.

6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 82, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c'. Britton further discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client

document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It is

well-known for computers, such as web server #48, to provide a caching capability. It is also a

well-known practice to put links in HTML documents, such as Fig. 3 #45c'. However, Britton

does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of

scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been

inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520

and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script

conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col.

6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 83, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c'. Britton further discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client

document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents.

However, Britton does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the

recoding of scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have

been inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements

#520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses

script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught
in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have
allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on
an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable
to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 84, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a
client in Fig. 3 #45c'. Britton further discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client
document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It is a
well-known practice to put links in HTML documents, such as Fig. 3 #45c'. However, Britton
does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of
scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been
inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520
and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script
conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col.
6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have
allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 85, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c' and a script interpreter capability in Fig. 4 #48. However, Britton does not

explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts, i.e.,

portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time

of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as

the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script conversions, such as

from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50,

describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 86, Britton discloses sending a converted document to a

client in Fig. 3 #45c'. Britton further discloses a web server #48 for receiving a client

document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It is a

well-known practice to put links in HTML documents, such as Fig. 3 #45c'. However, Britton

does not explicitly teach script substitution. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of

scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been

inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520

and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script

conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col.

6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have

allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on

an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

10.   **Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over

Britton (US Patent No. 6,591,289, filed Jul. 27, 1999 and issued Jul. 8, 2003, hereafter referred

to as "Britton") in view of Harrington et al (US Patent No. 6,775,820, filed Nov. 29, 2000 and

issued Aug. 10, 2004, hereafter referred to as "Harrington") and further in view of Bickmore et

al (US Patent No. 6,857,102, provisionally filed Apr. 7, 1998 and issued Feb. 15, 2005, hereafter

referred to as "Bickmore").

   Regarding dependent claim 11, Britton does not explicitly teach the use of personal

communication terminals. Harrington, though, discloses Bickmore discloses the well-known use

of a personal communication terminal as a client device in the Abstract and in col. 4 lines 45-54.

The Office further notes that Bickmore teaches the use of scripting in col. 3 lines 29-30. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply

the teachings of Bickmore for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington, because to do so

would have allowed a programmer to re-author documents designed for a larger display area for

display on a smaller display area, as taught by Bickmore in col. 3 lines 60-63, and would have

taught a designer to employ a server to provide transformation services to conserve wireless

bandwidth and device memory, as further taught by Bickmore in col. 3 lines 5-9 in the context of

col. 3 lines 22-24. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-

based programming.

   Claim 23 is substantially similar to claim 11, and therefore likewise rejected.

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted

that the amendments have significantly changed the scope of the claims.

The Applicant's arguments vice the Harrington reference were directed toward limitations not attributed to Harrington in this action. Applicant further argues that several new limitations are not taught by the references cited in the previous action. With the exception of Harrington, those references were not cited in this action, and thus Applicant's arguments are moot. It is noted that, as a secondary reference, Harrington was still cited for its script conversion teachings. The newly cited limitations, discussed on pages 19-20 of the amendment have been discussed above (in the section detailing the rejections under 35 USC §103(a)) as being taught by the newly cited reference Britton.

For these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) as set forth above.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patents

Heninger et al	6,470,349
Simonoff et al	6,091,412
Stedman et al	6,081,837
Andersen	5,999,941
Blumer et al	5,890,171
Blumer et al	5,732,219
Hirabayashi et al	6,549,936

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The current fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: February 24, 2006

rms

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
3/3/2006